

COBBETT'S WEEKLY REGISTER.

VOL. 42.—No. 4.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 27, 1822. [Price 6d.

Published every Saturday Morning, at Six o'Clock.

A
SECOND LETTER
TO MR. WESTERN,
*On his intended Motion for a
Repeal of Peel's Bill.*

“ However, TIME now stands, the
“ *Palm* in one hand, and the *Fool's*
“ *Cap* in the other: the Nation are
“ looking on, and will be speedily
“ called upon to make the award.”

REGISTER, 5 September 1819.

Kensington, 24 April 1822.

SIR,

It was my intention to address, this week, a Letter to the *English Protestants* on the subject of the treatment of the *Irish Catholics*; and, indeed, I was actually doing it, when, through the means of some friend, I received a copy of your *Second Address to the Landowners*, just published by Mr. Ridgway in Piccadilly. I

have, therefore, changed my subject; for, though that of *Irish Tithes* (which is the real matter in dispute) is of great importance; and *must* come to issue at no distant day, it is second to your subject, which is the master of the whole. It is, in fact, that on which all measures of reform or relief of whatever kind have a complete dependence.

This new Pamphlet of your production contains an express declaration of your intention to move for a *repeal*, or, at least, a *re-consideration*, of the Bill of Peel; and, as I now find, that you have a *measure* in your eye for *settling things*, without any mention, or any apparent thought, of a *Reform of Parliament*, I shall notice a little this proposed measure of yours, first examining

G

Printed and published by C. CLEMENT, No. 183, Fleet Street.

those parts of your Pamphlet, which precede the mention of it.

And here let me, at once, charge you with *plagiarism* the most gross. You think it just and right to give Locke's *name* with Locke's words. Why not *mine*? Both factions I find alike in this respect. You are, as the country people in Essex say, "all tarred with the same stick!" You seem to forget, that it is not *pride*, but *meanness*, that can induce men to be guilty of literary theft. Curious, too, that you should all be so forward to quote Old *Jenkinson*, *Hume*, *Smith*, and *Locke*. Those, who were all *placemen*, or *pensioners*, or both, you seem to think it an honour to have read, though famously blunderheaded they are in many things. However, I shall not *reason* with you: I shall inflict punishment on you: I shall *post you up*, and leave you to be laughed at. I will bring your haughty stomachs down, before I have done with you. I will make your Aristocratic insolence bend before the superior mind of

the "Lower Orders." I am the only man that ever really *tackled* you. Thousands of men of greater talent than myself have felt your injustice, have hated and despised, but have, at last, become *underlings* to you. They have wanted the *toiling* disposition, the *perseverance*, and above all things, the *self-denial*, necessary to enable them to tackle you and stick to you to the end. I want none of these. I shall not, therefore, become your underling; but shall pull you well down before this thing be over. As to what any of you say *in-doors*, you are protected by an act of your own to *banish* those who shall say that which has a *tendency* to bring you into *contempt*. This protection does not follow you into the *bookseller's shop*. When you are weak enough to expose yourselves there, we are permitted to laugh at you. You have not even yet taken so much care of your literary reputations as you have of your *game*. You cannot transport us for being found, after sun-set, "lurking"

round book-shops in pursuit of "have a right so to indulge their
your Pamphlets. "hopes."

You begin your Pamphlet, this Sir; all the rest is mine, as every
new Address to the Landowners, reader of the Register well knows.
by a re-statement of the extent of The *tenth* Letter to the Landlords;
the distress; and, having done the rustic harangue at Lynn; and
this, you proceed thus: "I ob- several other articles contain this
served, that such a case never precise mode of stating the case.
before occurred in the history of But, as to your *call upon the Mi-*
any civilized country. I called nisters; pray, Sir, what right have
upon Ministers to tell me if such you to call upon them in this style?
a calamity had ever visited the We are clearly to infer from this
cultivators of the soil in any age passage, that you *blame them* for
or nation. No revolution, no the calamities that you have de-
civil war ever made such havoc scribed; that you blame them for
in the property of that class of this revolution in property; for
the people, as has already taken this havoc amongst that class of
place. It is the class which even men, whose affairs have never
an invading enemy pays the until now been regarded as other
greatest respect to, on account than solid as the earth they cul-
of the superior importance of tivate. And, what right, I ask,
their occupation to society; I have you to impute this blame to
asked how this could happen in the Ministers? You have your-
a moment of profound peace, self been in parliament as long as
after a period too of seven years I can remember any thing about
of undisturbed tranquillity, when politics. And, did you ever at-
if nations can ever expect to be tempt to prevent the measures that
prosperous and happy, they you say have been the cause of

this havoc ? However, let us, before we go further, hear you as to this cause.

“ *The causes of this phenomenon appear to me daily more distinct and evident ; so indeed they do to every body who devote any serious unbiassed attention to the subject.* IT INDISPUTABLY HAS ARISEN ALTOGETHER FROM THE OPERATION OF THE ACT OF 1819 ; BY WHICH OUR ENORMOUS BURTHENS ARE LEVIED, AND ALL PECUNIARY ENGAGEMENTS CHARGED IN THE OLD STANDARD OF VALUE PRIOR TO 1797, INSTEAD OF THAT IN WHICH THEY WERE IMPOSED AND CONTRACTED. It is clear, by what is passing under our eyes, that such a change must be attended with fatal consequences ; that the industry of the country cannot sustain it ; that the relative situations of individuals and classes will be entirely altered, and that the progress of that alteration will create a convulsion that will be dangerous to all.” Well, then, Peel’s Bill,

according to you, is the cause of the mischief. This is true, if you include the *previously adopted measures* for a return to cash-payments. For want of your doing this, you expose yourself to the shots of the Oracles and Edinburgh Reviewers, and even that old Ass, the Times Newspaper has his kick at you, and pretty fairly too. For he says, there was Agricultural distress in 1814, 1815, 1816 and 1817. Peel’s Bill was not passed, then ; and, *therefore*, Peel’s Bill cannot have been the only cause of the distress now. This is a fair enough hit on the part of this old Jack-Ass, who only copies, indeed, word for word, from the Oracle’s article in the Chronicle ; but, no matter for that, he hits you ; and it is better to parry his blows ; which is done at once by including in the causes the steps taken by the Bank in 1814, 1815 and 1816.

However, did *you* ever, in the proper time and place, complain of these causes ? Did you ever so much as point them out ? Did

you ever even allude to them, though in the most distant degree? Never. Yet you had a seat in parliament all the time! If, then, you could see none of these causes, what right have you to blame the Ministers? Are you, who have been, all the while, a member of parliament as well as any one of them, and who have had neither loan-jobbers nor boroughmongers to bother you; are you now to say to them: "I could not see these causes, but you ought to have seen them?" They ought indeed to have seen them; but, it was as much your duty as theirs to see them; and, if you felt your incapacity to penetrate into such causes, you should have told your constituents that you were unfit to represent them. I, William Cobbett, have, indeed, a right to blame the Ministers; for I saw, from the first, and pointed out, these causes of mischief, and even in 1816, depicted the consequences in the loss of Sir Giles Jolterhead's estate. But, I have a right to blame you as well as the Ministers; and

blame you I must; or else I act a very partial and base part.

Nay, Sir, I contend, that you are more to blame than the Ministers. You have, though the public may seem to have forgotten it, been a *great actor in the thing*; a great mischief-doer, whatever your intentions may have been; and, I understand this fine THING a great deal too well to be humbugged by the mere name of "Country Gentleman," amongst those who take which title we see some of the most mean and despicable wretches in the kingdom. "Glory" has a class whom he calls "*the Gentlemen of England*." Whether these be the same as "the Country Gentlemen," I know not; but, this I know, that the far greater part of all those whom I have had pointed out to me as "Country Gentlemen," are, on an average, whether in point of honour or of intellect, far beneath the average of any common soldiers or sailors that I ever saw. A set of greedy, proud, mean, and servile wretches;

"meanness that soars, and pride
"that licks the dust." They are
always grubbing about after posts
and pensions for their families.
They are tyrants in their vil-
lages, and slaves, even the slaves
of slaves, three or four deep,
when they get within the air of
Court.

I do not, however, class *you*,
Sir, with this swarm of base rep-
tiles; but, I wish to be clearly
understood as bearing you not an
atom of respect on account of your
being what is called "a country
gentleman." I come back from
this digression to repeat, that you
have been a *great actor*, and a
great mischief-doer, as to the mat-
ter before us; and, if I allow, as
I do, that you did the mischief
without intending it, I go quite as
far on the good-natured side as
any one would go, who had been
pillaged without acknowledgment,
as I have been by you.

When great calamities take
place, a wise man will look back
to the *cause*, and, he will inquire
into the cause of that cause, if

he can. Now, it is very certain,
that the cash-payment measures
are the immediate cause of the pre-
sent revolution in property; but,
it is also certain, that the *Minis-
ters* are not to be blamed for the
cash-payment measures. I am
not to be carried away by any cry
of *Whig* or *Tory*: that is all a
scandalous humbug. I am sitting
here, at this table, in judgment on
you all. And, let poor Old Nick
have his due, and Castlereagh
and Jenky also: and I must say,
that, from first to last, *the devil a
halfpenny did they ever wish to
pay in gold, or in metal* of any
sort or size; an assertion which I
am ready to maintain against any
"Country Gentleman" that ever
swaggered over poacher or cring-
ed before a Secretary of the
Treasury.

This is a great matter, mind,
Sir. This is no trifling part of
the history of this Agricultural
Distress. The Ministers were the
authors neither of *Corn-Bill* nor
Cash-Bill; and, it really is a little
hard, that they should bear the

whole of the blame! "What! "Are they good men, then, and "wise ministers, and worthy of "support?" Oh! that is quite another thing! But, we are not to confound in this way. Because they authorized Sidmouth's Circular of 1817 and his Letter to the Manchester sabre-fellows in 1819, it does not follow, that they would have paid in cash! And this is the matter which we have now before us.

Be it remembered, then, that so far from discovering any eagerness to get into cash-payments, they used every artifice in their power to keep out of them. In 1814, they ought to have paid in cash; but, the American war served them as a pretext for delay. When that war was over, they found out another reason for putting off the evil day. And thus they kept on from 1814 to 1819. All this while, they were baited by your side of the House to come to cash-payments. You will say, perhaps, that I baited them too! That is true enough; but, mark;

I always accompanied my call for cash-payments with a call for a reduction of army, navy, salaries, sinecures, pensions, grants, and interest of Debt, which your side of the House never did, the reasons for which are plain enough, when we consider, that there are as many pensions and sinecures on one side as on the other!

Thus, though they did not actually come to cash-payments, they endeavoured to get prepared for it; and to get prepared, paper must be drawn in. The drawing in of paper must lower prices. It did lower prices. This produced distress. And then came the Corn-Bill project. You, Sir, were at the head of this project. The Ministers rejected it the first year; but, the second they were compelled to yield. I say compelled; for they yielded avowedly against their own opinions and wishes.

Now, Sir, look into the Register of 1814 and 1815; and there you will find me remonstrating with you and Mr. Coke; endea-

vouring to convince you, that your Corn-Bill *will do you no good*; praying you to think nothing about the importations of corn, but to think constantly about the *drawing in of the paper*; beseeching you to look at the Old Lady's tricks; and, in short, explaining to you all the causes of the low prices, as clearly as ever one of Mr. Brougham's Grannies explained the alphabet to a child.

The Corn-Bill was passed, however, and, as I had foretold, it did no good to the farmer. Then came 1816, when you appeared again with a *Seed-Bill*. Now, this was doing infinite *mischiefs*. It was laying the *foundation* of Webb Hall's crack-brain delusions. You cannot be easily excused for this, Sir. It was a perseverance, an obstinate perseverance in error; and in *mischievous* error too. On the 10th of February, in that year, before you brought forward your motion on the "*distresses of the country*," I again remonstrated

with you on the subject, in words, which justice to myself and to my *disciples* also, calls upon me to insert here. They have for years, *had battles to fight for me*. They have endured loads of obloquy on my account. Justice to them as well as to myself, therefore, demands that I *prove*, that, if my advice had been followed, the 'present calamities never would have been witnessed. Justice to those also who subscribed towards the Coventry-Contest, demands that I prove, when the occasion so fully warrants it, that, if I had been in parliament, right notions would have prevailed years and years ago, and that the Bill of Peel would never have been passed, without such *accompanying measures* as would have prevented the present destructive consequences. "As to the intended *discussion*" "on the *distressed state of the country*, it is impossible for me to know *what* it will produce; but, there can certainly be no benefit attending a mere *display*

" of those distresses. They are
 " known and felt in every family,
 " which does not live upon the
 " taxes. It cannot, therefore, be
 " of any use to paint them in
 " speeches in Parliament. And
 " give me leave to say, that I
 " do not believe, that such dis-
 " cussions can lead to any prac-
 " tical result of any real utility,
 " unless there be some measure
 " proposed for taking off at
 " least 20 millions of the taxes
 " now paid. Mr. COKE, on the
 " first day of the session, com-
 " plained, that the farmers had
 " *no market* for their grain. This
 " was a mistake to be sure: for
 " they can always sell it for
 " *something*. They have always
 " a *market*; but, it is *high price*
 " that they want; and I defy any
 " human power to give them this,
 " without augmenting the quan-
 " tity of the paper-money. When
 " the low price was imputed to
 " the importations from abroad,
 " the remedy was easy, supposing
 " the importations to have been the
 " real cause and the only cause.

" The remedy was applied, but it
 " was soon found to be useless,
 " because the far greater part of
 " the cause of low price did not
 " consist in the importations. The
 " cause that *now* operates is a
 " very different one indeed. It is
 " general and powerful, and must
 " be durable, unless removed by
 " new issues of paper. It is
 " strange that Mr. COKE should
 " not see this cause; and if he
 " does see it, that he should
 " content himself with merely
 " talking of the *evil*. If Mr. WES-
 " TERN does not do more than
 " this, he may as well do no-
 " thing at all; for, as to a mere
 " display of the distresses of the
 " country, it will be perfectly
 " useless. Great, however, are
 " the *expectations* from the result
 " of that day's proceedings. The
 " farmers think that *zummut* is
 " yet to be *done* for them, and so
 " do the shopkeepers. I should
 " not like to have excited such
 " expectations, unless I were re-
 " solved to lay all *bare*, and to
 " propose, in the most distinct

"terms, a return, through thick
 "and thin, to the expenses of
 "1792, when wheat was nearly
 "as it is at this hour, and, per-
 "haps, as it ever will be again.
 "MR. WESTERN may be assured,
 "that *nibbling* will do no good.
 "It must be a *bite*, and a bite,
 "too, that will make the teeth
 "meet, and even to take out the
 "piece. It must be, not the snap
 "of a well-bred spaniel, but the
 "unrelenting grip of a bulldog.
 "This is too harsh, you will say.
 "Well, then, the thing may as
 "well remain as it is; for we are
 "past all help from barking and
 "snapping."

Now, Sir, can you read this
 passage, and reflect on the time
 and circumstances, and then look
 at the plagiarism in your present
 pamphlet, without feeling shame,
 and being anxious to beg my
 pardon? Oh, yes; that you can;
 and be just as full of pride and
 conceit as ever! The *public*,
 however, is sitting in judgment
 on us. "TIME has the *Palm* in
 one hand, and the *Fool's Cap* in

the other;" and the award is now
 just about to be made. Get
 Peel's Bill repealed, and the
decision is instantly made!

In spite of my remonstrances
 you persevered, and, early in
 March 1816, brought forward
 your *Resolutions*. Such a string
 of nothings never before appeared
 upon paper. Not a word about
 the *effects of the currency*. That
 was to be beaten into the heads
 of none of you; though you have
 now found out that the currency
 is *every thing*. I shall presently
 show you how clearly I proved
 this to you *then*; but, first of all
 let me repeat my question: With
 what justice can you now *blame*
 the *Ministers*, you, who saw the
 distress in 1814, 1815 and 1816,
 and who dealt largely in *remedies*,
 too; but, who never said *one*
single word about this all-import-
 tant thing, the currency? You
 were for laws to *raise*, or *keep up*,
 the *price of produce*. And, if
 you despised all the advice of-
 fered to you upon the subject,
 with what reason do you throw

blame upon the Ministers, because they did not listen to that advice ! They adopted, not their own measures, but *yours*. They passed all the Bills that you asked to have passed, and, I beg to know, then, upon what ground you impute the fatal consequences to them ?

Now, Sir, in order to show, that you had no excuse for your conduct in 1816, which was merely the forerunner of the ruinous delusions of *Webb Hall*; in order to show, that the effects of the diminution of the quantity of the currency ought to have been as clear to you in 1816 as they are in 1822. Read the following from the Register of 9th of March of the former year; and then make an apology for yourself if you can. " This military and naval establishment, " together with the interest of the " debt and the sinking fund, which " latter is full as necessary as the " interest of the debt itself; all " these require, and will require " for ever, sixty millions of pounds

" a-year, at the very least. To " pay this sixty millions of pounds " a-year, while an immense navy " commanded all the advantages " of all the trade in the world; " and while this Island appeared " to be the only safe place in " Europe for the depositing of " money and of riches of all " sorts; and especially while there " was afloat a paper currency so " abundant as to be within the " reach of every one; to pay this " sixty millions a-year during this " state of things was no great difficulty; but from the moment " that peace was made with America, followed as it immediately " was by peace with France, and " preceded as it had been the year " before by peace on the continent " of Europe; from that moment the " navy, which had before swept " the seas of all their riches, became ineffectual; foreigners, " who now saw the continent a " safe place to return to, took " their money out of the country " of the Income Tax, and returned home, leaving us to pay

" the Income Tax ourselves.
 " Numerous English families
 " flocked to the continent, leaving
 " their share of the poor-rates
 " to be paid by those who re-
 " mained behind. But, the great
 " thing of all, was, the absolute
 " necessity which now arose of
 " diminishing the quantity of
 " paper money in circulation.
 " Unless this was done, the Bank
 " paper must have continued at
 " a discount of from thirty to
 " forty per cent., and the exchange
 " against us with foreign countries
 " must have been in the same
 " proportion. Therefore, the
 " quantity of paper was dimi-
 " nished; by what means, at what
 " time, and in what manner, I
 " have described to you before,
 " in the Second Number of this
 " present volume, in my Letter to
 " your Secretary of the Treasury,
 " where I have told you the whole
 " story about the operations of the
 " Treasury, and of the Governors
 " and Directors of the Bank of
 " England. I have frequently be-
 " fore shown, that this diminution

" of the quantity of paper, neces-
 " sarily produced that confusion
 " in the affairs of all men in trade,
 " which confusion has been fol-
 " lowed by the distresses spoken
 " of before. For instance, the
 " Bank note, the Pound note is,
 " to-day, worth thirteen shillings
 " in silver. I borrow a pound of
 " my neighbour. Next week this
 " same pound note is worth twenty
 " shillings in silver. My neigh-
 " bour calls upon me to pay him
 " the pound. Consequently I pay
 " him a thing that is worth seven
 " shillings more than that which
 " I borrowed. Farmers who took
 " their lands, put it into high con-
 " dition and stocked it well with
 " cattle and implements, while
 " wheat was fifteen shillings a
 " bushel, have now, all at once,
 " sunk half the principal money
 " that they laid out. If they bor-
 " rowed money upon mortgage for
 " the sake of effecting these pur-
 " poses, or for the sake of pur-
 " chasing land, they have now, in
 " in fact, to pay nearly double what
 " they paid before, as the interest

" of the money so borrowed. There
 " are thousands of men who
 " bought land, paying half the
 " purchase money down, and
 " leaving the other half as mort-
 " gage upon the land. The half
 " which they paid down, they
 " have lost, the land being at this
 " time, worth no more than what
 " it is mortgaged for. All the
 " tradesmen and manufacturers,
 " and merchants, who have been
 " trading upon borrowed money,
 " must be very lucky indeed if
 " they escape ruin. Seeing
 " that they have to *pay* in a cur-
 " rency of higher real value than
 " the currency was in which
 " they *borrowed*. Accompanying
 " this has come an abatement in
 " prices, which, of course, ren-
 " ders it impossible for the people
 " to continue to pay sixty millions
 " of taxes in a year. You have
 " seen enough of the paltry reme-
 " dies proposed by others, who
 " either want the sense, or want
 " the courage to propose to the
 " country that which alone can
 " afford it a chance of surmount-

" ing its difficulties without first
 " being plunged into uproar and
 " confusion. Men are *shy* upon
 " this score. They fear to give
 " offence. Every one has his
 " circle of friends. Those who
 " are able to write, or to speak in
 " public, have *generally* some in-
 " terest or other to restrain them.
 " Many are afraid of mere popu-
 " lar clamour. For my part, I
 " am restrained by none of these
 " considerations; and shall, there-
 " fore, speak out as freely as if I
 " were sitting by my fire-side."

And, is it *after this* that you
 can publish a sort of *discovery*,
 that the augmentation of the value
 of the currency is the cause of the
 distress? Can you, recollecting
 this, as you must recollect it, pub-
 lish to the world an extract from
Locke, pretending that it is from
him that you have got your light
 upon the subject? Yes; that you
 can; and expose yourself to the
 contempt of every candid and
 just man in the kingdom rather
 than do justice to me.

But, again, *why blame the mi-*

nisters? They were not bound to understand this matter better than you. In this same Register (six years ago, mind) you were told, that, after ruin had "done its worst for the farmers, the estates of the landlords would be transferred." Six years ago you were told this, and, indeed, had been told it several years before even that. What apology was there, then, for you at that time; or, what apology is there for you at this time in not quoting my words with my name instead of pretending that you have been enlightened by *Locke*, whose doctrine is general, and does not directly point at our case? How *industrious* a reader you have been! How *deep* in your researches! What a pity, since *Locke* has enlightened you, that you did not read *Locke* before you were so eager for Corn-Bills!

However, leaving now these former periods, what a pity you did not read *Locke* before Peel's Bill was passed! You ascribe all the mischief to this Bill. That is

manifestly wrong, because the mischief began as soon as the Bank began to draw in the paper, which was in 1814, five years before Peel's Bill was passed. But, at any rate, if Peel's Bill be so mischievous a measure, why did you not *oppose* Peel's Bill? And, if you did not see any reason for *opposing* it, is it *just* in you now to blame the Ministers for the mischief it has done, and is doing? Have you, a Member for a county, and about thirty years a Member of the House of Wisdom, any right to assume, that you are to be exempted from all share of the blame due to a measure, which, at the very least, you suffered to pass without a single breath of opposition? Without even a suggestion as to any fatal, or even disagreeable, consequence?

Here, too, you as well as all the other opponents of the Ministers were not without advice, very *impressively given*, long beforehand too, and accompanied with reasons most elaborately stated. In November 1817, I (being then

in Long Island) wrote a *petition* to the House of Commons, stating the *causes of the distress*, and praying for the *suitable remedy*; namely, a *reduction of interest of Debt*, of *salaries, pensions, sinecures*, and *public pay* of all sorts. This was the *too long* petition, which Lord Folkestone did not present; which I wished to have on the *Journals of the House*, that it might afterwards be quoted to my honour; and which I will not suppose that Lord Folkestone refused to present from any mean or bad motive. In July 1818, I sent you over the *Letter to Tierney*; and, when *Peel's Bill* had been passed, I sent you over a *Letter to the Regent*, from which I have taken the motto to this present *Letter* to you.

These *three papers* will live, and long live, in proof of my superiority over you all: they will live to your shame and to my honour. Here was the *warning* of the danger: here was the *remedy*: here is the *prophecy* as to the consequences of *despising* the

warning, or *rejecting* the remedy. These *three papers* I have just republished in one pamphlet, *price sixpence!* Six-Acts have not been able to effect their object; but, God knows my mind and heart, and I have taken, and always shall take, the *will for the deed*; and shall always feel and act accordingly. I remember what was said by *Mackintosh, Scarlett* and *Brougham*, during the discussions on those acts, and I am not fool enough not to have perceived the influence that set their tongues in motion. I remember that the man was put in gaol for ten weeks, who went round an English town to announce that *I had arrived in good health*. The immediate actors in these scenes never attracted much of my attention. I looked back, and looked back, to the first movers; and I thank God for what *I now behold*, and for what I shall and must behold.

So much for the *past*. But, you have a *remedy*; and, now let us look at that. First, however, as I have said so much about your

being *enlightened*, all of a sudden, by *Locke*, let us see what it is that *Locke* says; and, it will be curious enough, if we should find, that the passage quoted is not only *inapplicable* to our case, but *false* in its doctrine, into the bargain.

The words are these: "The exigencies and uses of money *not lessening* with its quantity, and it being in the same proportion to be employed and distributed still, in all the parts of its circulation; so much as its *quantity* is *lessened*, so much must the share of every one that has a right to this money, *be the less*; whether he be landholder for his goods, or labourer for his hire, or merchant for his brokerage.—If *one-third* of the money employed in trade, were locked up, or gone out of England, must not the landholders necessarily receive *one-third less* for their goods, and consequently rents fall! a *less* quantity of money by *one-third* being to be distributed amongst an *equal* number of receivers?"

Indeed people not perceiving the money to be gone, are apt to be jealous one of another; and each suspecting another's inequality of gain, to rob him of his share; every one will be employing his skill and power, the best he can, to retrieve it again, and to bring money into his pocket, in the same plenty as formerly. But this is but scrambling amongst ourselves, and helps no more against our wants, than the pulling of a short coverlet will, amongst children that lie together preserve them all from the cold; some will starve, unless the father of the family provides better, and enlarges the scanty covering. This pulling and contest is usually between the landed man and the merchant, for the labourer's share, being seldom more than a bare subsistence, never allows that body of men, time or opportunity to raise their thoughts above that, or struggle with the richer for theirs, (as one com-

“mon interest,) unless when some
 “common and great distress,
 “uniting them in one universal
 “ferment, makes them forget
 “respect, and emboldens them to
 “carve to their wants with armed
 “force, and then sometimes they
 “break in upon the rich, and
 “sweep all like a deluge.”

This passage, which you call
 “almost miraculous,” is, in fact,
 a very poor, common-place thing,
 and the figure, in the middle of it,
 perfectly absurd. The notion,
 that prices will fall one-third by
 the removal out of the country of
 one-third of the money, is false.
 Locke had not had, like you, the
 advantage of getting the Letter to
 Tierney for two-pence, and, there-
 fore, he might be excused. In
 that Letter it is shown, that the
 taking away of a third of the
 money, will make prices fall much
 more than a third. It is a false
 notion, too, that there will be any
 “scrambling” on account of a di-
 minution of the quantity of money
 in a country. It is false to sup-
 pose, that a small quantity is not

as good as a large quantity, as is
 here supposed; except as applied
 to cases of Debts and Contracts
 and Taxes and Pay out of Public
 Money, the rate of which is already
 fixed; and to these Locke makes
 no allusion. What are the la-
 bourers to be in a ferment for on
 account of the quantity of money
 in the country; unless there be
 certain fixed taxes or payments
 out of the public stock to produce
 oppression? So that this “almost
 miraculous” passage, which, in
 the first place, has not the most
 distant application to our case, is,
 in itself, if not a tissue of errors, at
 least a very bald and inadequate
 explanation of the thing intended
 to be explained.

We now come to your remedy,
 which is described in these words:
 “I have pledged myself to bring
 “before the House, in some form
 “or other, a consideration of the
 “effects of that Act, and perhaps
 “shall move a repeal of it, with
 “the view subsequently and gra-
 “dually to adjust the standard of
 “value in proportion to the rate

"of prices, and the value of
 "money since the year 1797; and
 "according to which, public and
 "private debts, taxes, monied en-
 "gagements and contracts have
 "been made and imposed; and
 "for the purpose of regulating
 "the same according to the me-
 "dium price of corn and other
 "essential articles, as well as la-
 "bour during that period. I am
 "perfectly aware of the extreme
 "delicacy and difficulty of such
 "adjustment: it will require time
 "and most mature deliberation.
 "The Act of 1797 has thrown us
 "into a situation, from which, to
 "extricate ourselves, must be a
 "work of infinite difficulty; no
 "path presents itself which is not
 "strewn with thorns; but that
 "we have chosen, leads to inevi-
 "table destruction, and we must
 "reconsider and retrace our
 "steps."

In so important a matter, you
 ought to have been very precise
 and clear in your definition. I
 do not know what you mean

by "adjusting the standard of
 "value in proportion to the rate
 "of prices and the value of money
 "since the year 1797." How-
 ever, what I suppose you to mean
 is this: To reduce the intrinsic
 value of the coin, so as to make a
 bushel of wheat sell for as much
 nominally as it did between 1797
 and 1814. There is nothing new
 here. It is Mr. JAMES' ("Lord
 Little-Shilling's") project. It is
 what Mr. THOMAS ATTWOOD has
 contended for with as much ability
 as can be employed upon such a
 subject.

To make the reduction suffi-
 cient, the gold Sovereign must
 pass for three pounds, which
 would be a pretty decent pull
 upon creditors and receivers. It
 would be perfectly just as far as
 relates to all payments out of the
 public money. But, would it be
 just towards yearly servants, the
 whole of whom would be actually
 defrauded of two-thirds of a part,
 at least, of their year's wages?
 Then, pray consider private cre-
 ditors, amongst whom are all

tradesmen, the whole of whom, such as butchers, bakers, upholsterers, and all common tradesmen who have yearly, or long, bills on their customers, *must be ruined*. Wholesale tradesmen, the whole of whose capital is frequently in book debts, must also be ruined. Merchants and Manufacturers, having debts due them abroad must also be ruined. Annuity holders on contracts of recent date; owners of house and land recently let; recent mortgagees; all these would be grievously injured. The *labourers* would also be injured greatly; for it would *take time* to get their wages up again.

Have you looked well at the *agitation*, which the very mention of a design to *clip the shilling*, or to *reduce its size*, would create? Do you imagine that *any paper* would pass after such a measure? Have you an idea of the confusion and uproar that an attempt of the kind would create? Have you thought of the manner in which the *soldiers* would relish such a

measure; or, would you make an exception in their favour?

You say very fairly, "that no path presents itself which is not strewed with thorns;" but, I can assure you, that this is *the most thorny of all*. There is a great deal better way than this of getting out of the difficulty; and one that I believe from my soul the Ministers would have come to before now, if they had been let alone; if those bothering metaphysicians from the North had not pestered them with their "bullion-question." Paper-money is only Paper-money, call it what you will. Repeal Peel's Bill; issue liberally; the more you speed the better; make a "Bank Restriction" as before; but, make *no legal tender except at the Bank*; and, the whole thing will be settled to universal satisfaction in about four months! This would, indeed, put an end to the Borough-system; but, if you see any harm in that, I must confess that I do not.

This is, I am confident, the

only way of saving any of the estates, unless by *reduction of interest of Debt* together with concomitant measures, by a *reformed parliament*; and, if I were to say, that I expect to see such reform, but in the last extremity, I should be a great deceiver. The *plan* for this adjustment, which I drew up in Long Island, and which would long ago have been before the country, if I had been returned for Coventry, is, I am pretty sure, the plan that will be adopted at last; that is to say, if any settlement at all be to take place without a convulsion. But, *time passes*. Every month renders a *just and quiet* settlement more difficult; and I do not wish to disguise, that I begin to think *that it will not take place*. There is great ground of confidence in the general information, in the good sense, in the justice, the moderation and humanity of the people. But, who is to answer for what a sudden burst may produce?

What you may mean, Sir, by our present path "leading to in-

"*evitable destruction*," I do not know. Destruction of *what*? All that I can see a *destruction* of is, the property which the *present owners* have in land. This will assuredly take place, if the present thing go on in its present way; and this is not clear *now*; but has been clear for years, and many years too. How this comes not to have been seen, when Peel's Bill was passed is strange enough; or, at least, it would be, if we were speaking of any *other assembly* on the face of the earth. It was *so evident* that that Bill must be ruinous to the land, in the end. You are a *deep* reader, Sir. You love *deep* things. Besides, it is *deepness* to name *Locke*. That is such a deep sound. Mr. *Waithman's* portrait, in a shop, on Ludgate Hill, represents him as having in his hand, "*Locke on the human understanding*." That is *so deep*! But, Sir, if I could but inveigle you to read the last of the *two-penny trashes* above-mentioned. The Letter to the Regent on the "*wild and vi-*

"sionary projects of the Borough-mongers!" If I could but prevail on you to do this, and that, too, before you make your motion, how happy should I be! It will teach you more useful matter than Locke ever taught any body, and will give you two pennyworth of laughter into the bargain. I have not seen that Number of the Register, that I know of, since I wrote it, till this very day, when I sent it to the press. The moment I clapped my eyes on it I fell a laughing. An association of ideas brought me back to the paper-tent where I wrote it, and to all the fun that I enjoyed at the time. But, when I come now to read it over soberly, I am surprized at the correctness of all the views there taken of the subject. It was then *prophecy*: it is a record of *facts*. All is verified to the letter. There was the Speaker (the Number related to the close of the Session of 1819) *congratulating* the Regent, that he had a House of Commons *wise enough* to pass

Peel's Bill! There was the Regent expressing, in the name and behalf of His Royal Father, *his satisfaction* that he had a House of Commons *so wise* as to discover the *safe* and *easy* means of returning to the ancient standard of value! And there was I, sitting in my shirt and trowsers, writing a *prophecy* upon the consequences of this measure of consummate wisdom! I am sure I never *read* what I wrote before it came off to England, and I do not recollect ever having seen it, in England, till this very morning. There were several Numbers, written in Long Island, after I got the news of the passing of Peel's Bill. I wished to republish *one* of them just now. I had frequently thought of the one that began with a commentary on the Speaker's *congratulatory speech*; and, this morning I looked it out. I say all this in order to tempt you to read it, Sir, before you make your motion.

Before I conclude this very long Letter, let me notice the

doctrine, which the *Oracle*, in conjunction with *Malthus* they say, has cooked up for the *comfort of the Landlords*. I have not, perhaps, a very clear conception of it, and I have not yet seen the pamphlet, or review, that contains it; but, from what I can gather, it is this: that, *if all foreign produce be kept out of the country, the land must yield the means of paying rent*. This is, in fact, the doctrine of the Treasury Pamphlet, published in January, and ascribed to Mr. COURTENAY. I took the part of Mr. Courtenay's pamphlet in my rustic harangue at Chichester, to which I beg leave to refer you. But, as this really seems to be the *last hope* of the Borough-mongers, I will here make a few observations on it.

The argument is this: "An article of such indispensable necessity as human food must continue to be raised: no article will continue to be raised, or made, for any length of time, unless it fetch a price

sufficient to pay the cost of production: human food does not now fetch a price sufficient to pay the cost of production including rent: therefore, the price of human food must rise, and must, in general, yield enough to pay rent, unless food be permitted to come from abroad."

I do not know, that this is precisely what they say; but, it is this in substance. Now, Sir, all the premises may be true; but, the conclusion is, I am convinced, false. To be sure human food will be raised, because, do what you will, hunger will, in case of necessity, take possession of the land. It is also true, that it will not be raised, for any length of time, without yielding enough of something or another to pay the cost of production; for, if, in some cases, it yields nothing beyond the food of him who tills the land, his labour is the cost and the only cost in certain cases. So far all is right. But, as to rent being part of the cost, that

may or may not be. This argument assumes, that rent is necessary to production; it assumes that human food cannot come without rent; it may as well assume that human food cannot come without tithes.

When we set about to raise wheat, for instance, we want the seed and the various kinds of labour from the seed-time to the winnowing. These are necessary. Without these the wheat cannot come. But, it will come without rent. Rent is what is left after the producing costs are paid. If there be nothing left, after those costs are paid, there is no rent; but this circumstance will not tend at all to put a stop to production.

But, the price will be, and must be, they say, sufficient to pay rent; for men will have rent for their land. If it be a will have, indeed; then they may have what rent they choose, and the prices must rise accordingly. Oh, no! The positive price of the produce does not depend solely on the cost

of raising it nor upon the quantity raised in proportion to the usual demand. It depends, too, as all other prices do, on the quantity of money circulating in the country. And, if to labour and seed, there be added another cost, called tax, which, no more than rent, is necessary to production, this tax may take away that which would otherwise be rent.

Suppose the farms of a country to be all of one size and quality; and suppose each to yield a rent of a hundred pounds a-year, leaving the farmer a bare existence, and nothing more. Then suppose the government to lay on a tax of a hundred a-year on each farm, payable by the farmer prior to rent. Must he not cease to pay rent? Could he raise his price? How could he raise his price, unless he could put more money into circulation in the country? Divest the thing of money altogether. Suppose him to have every year 100 bushels of corn to give to the landlord. If the government came and took that,

could he create another hundred bushels to give to the landlord?

But, landlords may choose, it is said, whether they will let their farms without getting rent. Yes, but they may *not choose* as to paying *land-tax*, and *poor-rates* too if they keep the farms in hand; and, if the farmer can pay them no rent, how are they to make it? They may let the land *lie fallow*. Yes, but they must, then, keep the labourers from some *other source*; and what source, I wonder can that be? The fact is, that when we come, thus, to analyse the thing, we find, that, though we talk of *Landowner*, and though he talks of *his property*, he is, after all, only *part proprietor*; and that, in short, neither parchments nor prescription, can take from the whole of the people of a country the *right to live upon the produce of the land*.

The question of *rent* or *no rent*, lies, properly speaking, in our present case, not between the *landlord and tenant*, but between the *landlord and the government*.

The government takes away as much as it likes. It takes, we will suppose, as much as it *can*. It *must* leave those who till the land sufficient to eat and to screen their carcasses from the inclemency of the weather, or they could not work, and would rebel. It *must* leave enough in the hands of the farmer to keep up his stock or he could not carry on production. But, there is *no must* in the case of *rent*. Production may go on very well *without that*. If the government *need* that, whether to keep down radicals or re-exalt the Bourbons, it can take it, without any hinderance to production; and, so "loyal" a body of men as the landlords of England, would hardly wish to keep what was needed for such purposes!

It appears to me, then, Sir, that this last hope of the Borough-mongers completely fails them; and, that the idea of some *overruling necessity* to bring them rents is as gross an absurdity as ever found its way into the head of Oracle. The general positive

price of the produce will depend upon the quantity of money in circulation. The quantity, or amount of the tax, will, or will not, take all away, except the *necessary producing costs*. If the tax leave nothing but the necessary producing costs there can be no rent; if it leave any thing more, that more will go to the landlord. In the necessary producing costs is included the *interest of the farmer's stock*; for, unless he have this he will *withdraw his capital from the land*. The landlord, you observe, cannot *withdraw*. His share comes, if at all, out of the earth itself and is inseparable from it. The parson will have his portion; for he comes and takes it away *out of the field*. The burden goes rolling back, till, at last, it settles on the shoulders of the landlord. It may happen, that the government, after leaving what it *must leave* with the husbandman and labourer, without leaving any thing for rent, will still *not have enough*. In that case, it must take the *parson's share*! Nor

should I be at all surprized to see this beginning in a short time. Perhaps the first step in this way may be to make the parson *divide* with the landlord! Give them the tithe between them, while the fundholder and soldier and placeman and pensioner take the rents!

However, the thing will assume so many and such strange shapes before it come to the close, that it would be presumptuous in any one but an *Oracle* to attempt to foretel particulars; and, therefore, Sir, I now take my leave of the subject for the present, by wishing you a *full house* and plenty of actors on both sides.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient

And most humble servant,

WM. COBBETT.

POSTSCRIPT.

SIR,—How *curiously* this thing does work. I had hardly closed the above letter to you, when the post brought me the intelligence, which you will find below! I have long been saying, that the *tithes must go*, in some way or other. It was not to be believed, that the

landlords would *lose all*, and let the parsons *keep all*. However, here is the thing. I have no time now for further comment.—Just let me add: Remember *Manchester* and *Parson Hay* and the *Living of Rochedale*!

"CHURCH IN DANGER!!!"

THIS cry, which, like that of "*Wolf! Wolf!*" in the fable, has often, and, indeed, always hitherto, been a *false cry*, a *sham cry*, seems at last, likely to become, like that of the shepherd's boy, but too true a cry, as the reader will, it is believed, clearly perceive, when he has looked well into the following account of a decision at the late *Quarter Sessions at Norwich*, on an appeal against the poor-rate by a *Reverend owner of Tithes*. A more *important* decision has seldom been made, and certainly never one *more just*. What! Can it be deemed *legal*, would any thing be worthy of the name of *law*, would the thing enforcing it be worthy of the name of government, if it left the tithe owner to enjoy a clear surplus, while it left not a farthing *of profit to the farmer* and not a farthing *of rent to the landlord*? Oh, no! Such glaring injustice

cannot be suffered to go on, in any part of the country long. These are the times to *try* what institutions are *made of*. It is clearly *profits* on which the assessment ought to be made; and, as the tithe is *all profit*, except the cartage and housing and threshing, surely it ought to be drawn upon till it be almost all taken away, if the farmer make no profit and can pay no rent unless the tithe be thus drawn upon. It is, however, wholly unnecessary to detain the reader by further preface on a case so obviously important, and so very well calculated to give our spiritual guides something to occupy their minds other than the duties of magistrates and the guardianship of *game-covers* and of *gaols*. The Reverend persons, who are at the head of the "*Society for propagating Christian Knowledge*" will now have something to think about other than the publishing of calumnious and base insinuations against "*Cobbett*" by name, and in language little more decent than that employed by the *fish-fags* of Billingsgate. These Reverend persons, who were always foremost in urging on the government *to war*, and who have not, as yet, borne any part of the burthen created by the war, will

now find what the effects of war really are; and, the good of it is, too, that it is with the *landlords*, and not with the *Jacobins*, that they have now to contend! The only thing that can, generally speaking, preserve any of the rent even another year is the taking of the tithes to keep the poor with. So that it is no matter to the *mass of the people*. Rent must go or tithe must go, *at once*; and both by-and-by.—Now for it.

“ At the last Norfolk Quarter Sessions, held at Norwich, on Wednesday the 17th day of April instant, the Court came to a most important decision on the Poor Laws, on an Appeal by the Reverend DR. BULWER, Rector of CAWSTON, against the *Poor Rates* for that parish. The Doctor had been rated at 550*l.* for his tithes, against which he appealed, upon the ground that it exceeded a fourth of the assessment upon the *tithe-able property in the parish*, which he contended was the proportion at which tithes should be assessed to the Poor Rate. The Court dismissed the appeal, being unanimously of opinion, that there was no rule in law for fixing a proportional assessment on tithes compared

“ with land, and that the only principle, was to assess all real property according to the *productive value or profit* which it yielded. This determination is important, as it recognizes a principle, the general application of which, at the present time, will necessarily be attended with the most serious results, both to the Farmer and the CLERGY; upon the latter of whom the chief burthen of supporting the poor will now, as in former times, be thrown. According to this principle it is evident, that, at present prices, the assessment upon land ought to be merely *nominal*, and that TITHES should be assessed at their *full amount*, it being notorious that no *profit* whatever is now afforded from land in general, and that that which the landlord receives in the *name of rent*, is in fact a payment out of the Farmer's capital, while TITHES being taken *clear of taxes and all other expenses* attending the raising of the crop, are nearly *ALL profit*. This decision has, we understand, excited a great sensation in Norfolk, and the Farmers, in many places, have already insisted upon a reduction of their assessments, and upon rating

“ the Parsons to the full amount
 “ of their tithes, as well *where*
 “ *they are compounded for*, as
 “ when taken in kind. Let the
 “ Farmers generally adopt this
 “ plan, and they will not only
 “ obtain *immediate and consider-*
 “ *able relief*, but, in a few months,
 “ they will see the Clergy as
 “ clamorous for Reform, as the
 “ most devoted Radical; for no-
 “ thing short of Reform (any al-
 “ teration in the law being wholly
 “ out of the question) can now
 “ prevent the tithes from *being*
 “ *wholly swallowed up in Poor*
 “ *Rates*. The above principle
 “ was acknowledged in its full
 “ extent a short time since in the
 “ Court of King’s Bench; Mr.
 “ Justice Holroyd having ex-
 “ pressly declared, that a rate on
 “ land, is in effect a rate on the
 “ *profits* of land, for where there
 “ are no profits, there is no be-
 “ *neficial occupation*.”—Vide
 4th Vol: Burn’s Justice, p. 77.
Chetwynd’s Edition.

THE SPRING.

I MUST just put on record some
 facts about the Winter and
 Spring.—On the 30th of March
 I saw, near Norwich, a field that
 had been *horse beans* last year,

and that had been ploughed up,
 and sowed with *wheat* in the fall;
 I saw in this field, beans (which
 had come up with the wheat)
 standing one in a yard, or so, all
 over the field, in *full bloom*, and
 as fine bloom as I ever saw. The
 beans were from 9 to 15 inches
 high.—6th April, bunches of
 the bloom of *Ten Week Stocks*
 for sale in Covent Garden Mar-
 ket, London. As fine bloom as
 one sees in general. The plants
 had stood out all the Winter at
 Fulham.—15th April, I saw
 Oak trees cut down and *barked*,
 in the parish of Farnham in Sur-
 rey, not far from the West End
 of the Hog’s Back, going from
 Guildford to Farnham.—15th
 April, *Ten Week Stocks* (out all
 Winter in a bleak nursery ground
 near Guildford) in full bloom.—
 24th April. *Some Horse-Chesnut*
 flowers *full out* (but not gene-
 rally, all over the tree) at Ken-
 sington.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

I HAVE received two letters this
 week, and one last week, on the
 subject of *Irish Tithes*, and a
 horrible subject it is! I should

like to insert these letters here; but, the writers, when they give way to their *honest* indignation, forget the gaols and dungeons, and the magistrates (some of whom are *parsons*) who have the "*visiting*" of those gaols and dungeons! The *thing* is as they describe it; the greedy and unfeeling *actors* are what they say they are. But, I must not, *as yet*, use their plain and honest language. Their letters are, therefore, of *little use*; for, they must be so *cut* and *hacked* about, that, at last, they become, not only inelegant, but unintelligible. This mortifies me very much. When these Correspondents sit down to write on *Irish Tithes*, let me beg of them to bear in mind *who it is* that they are likely to offend; and to ask themselves, whether it be a class that has ever been known to leave unexerted any power of punishment that it happened to possess? To mention *names*, in such a case, is wholly out of the question. With a little care, and a very little, all the ends may be answered, however. *Circumlocutionize* the profligate, guttling, hard-hearted, grinding, grasping, haughty and insolent crew. *Hypothesize* their cases and their conduct. This is the way to come at them. Above all things *stick*

exclusively to the temporalities. Never meddle with *spirituals*. All men are rational, when you talk about *so much an acre for tithe of corn or potatoes*; but, all men are not rational, when you talk about *images* and *holy water* and the *Pope*. It is best, therefore, in such cases, always to confine ourselves to the *Temporalities*. Mr. MILLS has a work on *Irish Tithes and Temporalis*, which, I hope, the public is soon to have in their possession. It presents a *picture*, which, if it could but be once seen by every man in the kingdom, would cause the immediate, the *instant*, abolition of the *monstrous original*; the equal of which has never been seen before in any country under the sun.

This Day is Published,
By JOHN M. COBBETT, No. 183,
Fleet Street.

THE HORSE-HOEING HUSBANDRY; OR, a Treatise on the Principles of Tillage and Vegetation; and also a Method of introducing a sort of Vineyard Culture into the Corn-Fields, in order to increase their Product, and diminish the common Expense.
By JETHRO TULL, of Shalborne,

" the Parsons to the full amount
 " of their tithes, as well *where*
 " *they are compounded for*, as
 " when taken in kind. Let the
 " Farmers generally adopt this
 " plan, and they will not only
 " obtain *immediate and consider-*
 " *able relief*, but, in a few months,
 " they will see the Clergy as
 " clamorous for Reform, as the
 " most devoted Radical; for no-
 " thing short of Reform (any al-
 " teration in the law being wholly
 " out of the question) can now
 " prevent the tithes from *being*
 " *wholly swallowed up in Poor*
 " *Rates*. The above principle
 " was acknowledged in its full
 " extent a short time since in the
 " Court of King's Bench; Mr.
 " Justice Holroyd having ex-
 " pressly declared, that a rate on
 " land, is in effect a rate on the
 " *profits* of land, for where there
 " are no profits, there is no be-
 " *neficial occupation*."—Vide
 4th Vol: Burn's Justice, p. 77.
Chetwynd's Edition.

THE SPRING.

I MUST just put on record some
 facts about the Winter and
 Spring.—On the 30th of March
 I saw, near Norwich, a field that
 had been *horse beans* last year,

and that had been ploughed up,
 and sowed with *wheat* in the fall;
 I saw in this field, beans (which
 had come up with the wheat)
 standing one in a yard, or so, all
 over the field, in *full bloom*, and
 as fine bloom as I ever saw. The
 beans were from 9 to 15 inches
 high.—6th April, bunches of
 the bloom of *Ten Week Stocks*
 for sale in Covent Garden Mar-
 ket, London. As fine bloom as
 one sees in general. The plants
 had stood out all the Winter at
 Fulham.—15th April, I saw
 Oak trees cut down and *barked*,
 in the parish of Farnham in Sur-
 rey, not far from the West End
 of the Hog's Back, going from
 Guildford to Farnham.—15th
 April, *Ten Week Stocks* (out all
 Winter in a bleak nursery ground
 near Guildford) in full bloom.—
 24th April. *Some Horse-Chesnut*
 flowers *full out* (but not gene-
 rally, all over the tree) at Ken-
 sington.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

I HAVE received two letters this
 week, and one last week, on the
 subject of *Irish Tithes*, and a
 horrible subject it is! I should

like to insert these letters here; but, the writers, when they give way to their *honest* indignation, forget the gaols and dungeons, and the magistrates (some of whom are *parsons*) who have the "visiting" of those gaols and dungeons! The *thing* is as they describe it; the greedy and unfeeling *actors* are what they say they are. But, I must not, *as yet*, use their plain and honest language. Their letters are, therefore, of *little use*; for, they must be so *cut* and *hacked* about, that, at last, they become, not only inelegant, but unintelligible. This mortifies me very much. When these Correspondents sit down to write on *Irish Tithes*, let me beg of them to bear in mind *who it is* that they are likely to offend; and to ask themselves, whether it be a class that has ever been known to leave unexerted any power of punishment that it happened to possess? To mention *names*, in such a case, is wholly out of the question. With a little care, and a very little, all the ends may be answered, however. *Circumlocutionize* the profligate, guttling, hard-hearted, grinding, grasping, haughty and insolent crew. *Hypothesize* their cases and their conduct. This is the way to come at them. Above all things *stick*

exclusively to the temporalities. Never meddle with *spirituals*. All men are rational, when you talk about *so much an acre for tithe of corn or potatoes*; but, all men are not rational, when you talk about *images* and *holy water* and the *Pope*. It is best, therefore, in such cases, always to confine ourselves to the *Temporalities*. Mr. MILLS has a work on *Irish Tithes and Temporalis*, which, I hope, the public is soon to have in their possession. It presents a *picture*, which, if it could but be once seen by every man in the kingdom, would cause the immediate, the *instant*, abolition of the *monstrous original*; the equal of which has never been seen before in a ny country under the sun.

This Day is Published,
By JOHN M. COBBETT, No. 183,
Fleet Street.

THE HORSE-HOEING HUSBANDRY; or, a Treatise on the Principles of Tillage and Vegetation; and also a Method of introducing a sort of Vineyard Culture into the Corn-Fields, in order to increase their Product, and diminish the common Expense.
By JETHRO TULL, of Shalborne,

Berks.—To which is prefixed, an **INTRODUCTION**, relating to the history and division of the Work, and giving an account of some recent experiments. By **WILLIAM COBBETT.**

In the *Proposals* for publishing this Work, it was stated, that the price to the Subscribers would not exceed *twelve shillings*. The great mass of print that the volume contains, the goodness of the print and paper, and the neat manner in which it has been completed, would make that charge not by any means too much. But, the *very liberal subscription* and the complete security against loss which that subscription has given, while they demand an expression of the pleasure that I derive from so unequivocal a compliment to my judgment, demand also, since it can be very well afforded, that I make the prices of the Work lower than was at first intended. The price, therefore, to Subscribers will be *ten shillings*, and the *selling price*, *thirteen shillings and sixpence*. — No money was taken *in advance* on the subscription. Gentlemen will now, therefore, please to send the money when they send for the books; and, in order that no one who may have intended to subscribe, shall

be excluded as to the *effect*, any gentleman who may have subscribed for one copy, and who may wish to have another for a friend, shall be at liberty to take a second copy at the subscription price.

TURNIP SEED.

ALL sold long ago! I am very sorry that I have none to oblige many gentlemen with, who have made application.

LAST VOL. OF REGISTER.

IT has been our custom to close a volume at the end of about every *six months*. But, we have now changed the length of time; and have begun to close the Volumes at the end of *three months*. The last volume was closed *the week before last*. Its *Title Page*, *Contents* and *Index* were attached to the last week's Register. It is our custom to print a certain number of copies to keep, to be *sold in Volumes*. We have some copies of the last volume, and of the volume before that, complete. The *price* is according to the number of Registers that the Volume contains.

THE REGISTER.

A GREAT deal of inconvenience has, in many cases, arisen to the Readers of the Register, *in the country*, from the irregular manner of supplying it; and this has, in some degree arisen from an irregular mode of doing the business in London. It has, therefore, been resolved, to make the trade-price *uniform*, and to charge all the trade, *in London*, the *usual regular trade-price*. As to *the Country*, the publisher has been surprised to find, that, in some towns, the Register is not to be had till the *Monday or Tuesday*, when it may always be had on the *Saturday*! At Norwich, Bristol, Portsmouth, and at every place whither a night coach, or mail, goes in one night [from London regularly, the Register may be received on the *Saturday*; because it may always leave London on the *Friday night*. So that, in whatever place, the Readers may find that they do not get the Register as soon as they ought to do, they may be assured, that the fault is, not in the want of punctuality in the supply from the office; but in something belong-

ing to the intermediate person, who takes it from the office and sends it to the country, and who has, perhaps, *other things to send*, about which he is more anxious than about the Register, which latter, therefore, he *keeps back*, in order to save the expense of two coach-parcels instead of one. To prevent this, in future, and to take away all grounds of delay, the publisher will send to the country himself, making the same allowance to the sellers in the country that he makes to those in London, and will *pay the carriage of the parcels*. The Register has, in the Country, been sold at *sixpence-halfpenny*, for the purpose of meeting the expense of *carriage* to which the country seller has been put. This will, of course, *no longer be done*, as the publisher will pay the carriage out of his own pocket. Thus will all the Trade and all Readers, whether in town or country, be put upon the same footing; and, as the alteration will necessarily tend to insure a regular and early delivery in all parts of the country, and must, of course, give satisfaction to all parties, the proprietor will incur without reluctance, the loss which he shall

sustain from paying the carriage of the parcels.—All those who may choose to apply to the Office, in order to be supplied in the country, may depend on having their orders punctually attended to. They will, on their parts, be so good as to be early and explicit in giving their orders. If

they wish to have *placards*, or to have their names mentioned in the imprint, or advertisements, as **SELLERS OF MR. COBBETT'S WRITINGS**, they will please to signify the same by Letter (post-paid) addressed to **JOHN M. COBBETT**, at The Register-Office, No. 183, Fleet Street, London.